UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/680,998	10/06/2000	Christopher Peiffer	1014-137US01	1970

7590 11/21/2005	EXAMINER	
Kent J. Sieffert	OSMAN, RAMY M	
Shumaker & Sieffert, P.A.		
Suite 105	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
8425 Seasons Parkway	2157	
St. Paul, MN 55125		

DATE MAILED: 11/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/680,998	PEIFFER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ramy M. Osman	2157

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 September 2005</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-42</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>3,20 and 41</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-42</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1.   This communication is responsive to amendment filed on September 8, 2005, where

applicant amended claims 1,4,9-17,19,23-31 and 33, and cancelled claims 3,20,41. Claims 1-42

are pending.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 9/8/2005 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

3.   Applicant argues that Brothers fails to teach "modification of web page source data".

In reply, Brothers was not relied upon to teach modification of web page source data.

Lafe et al was relied upon to teach this limitation (column 5 lines 1-45).

4.   Applicant argues that Lafe provides no teaching indicating an appreciation of a difference

between renderable and non-renderable data.

In reply, the non-renderable data mentioned in the limitation is interpreted to be the

"unsupported media object" and other data that is mention in Lafe column 5 lines 28-38.

5.   Applicant argues that Bodin does not teach rewriting tags from upper case to lower case.

In reply, 'tokenizing' and 'rewriting' of tags into lowercase are equated with eachother

since the claim language does not further explain the details of 'rewriting'. The claims do not

indicate that the 'rewriting' is a one-way operation and that the tags cannot be rewritten back to

uppercase.

6.   Applicant argues that Lafe does not teach filtering.

In reply, the word filter is broad and is broadly interpreted to simply perform some kind

of modification or alteration. The word filter has not been contextualized enough in the claim

language to disqualify the interpretation of Lafe et al. The compression of Lafe reads on filtering

since data alteration is performed in both compression and filtering.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

8.   **Claims 1,5-8,9,10,13,16-19,23,24,27,30-33,35,40 and 42 rejected under 35 U.S.C.**

103(a) as being unpatentable over Lafe et al (US Patent No 6,449,658) in view of Jungck

(US Patent No 6,728,785) in further view of Brothers (US Patent No 6,438,125).

9.   In reference to claims 1,19 and 33, Lafe teaches a method, a networking device and a

corresponding system for transferring web page source data between a web server and a remote

client over a computer network, the computer network including a wide area network, the

method comprising:

        receiving a request for the web page source data from the remote client at an acceleration

device (column 4 line 63 – column 5 line 5);

obtaining original web page source data from the web server, the original web page

source data containing renderable character data and non-renderable character data, the

renderable character data (column 5 lines 30 & 34) being data that affects the presentation of the

web page by a browser, and the non-renderable character data (column 5 line 35) being data that

does not affect the presentation of the web page by a browser, the original web page source data

being in a markup language format (column 5 lines 1-17 & 28-52);

filtering at least a portion of the non-renderable character data from the requested web

page source data, thereby creating modified web page source data (column 5 lines 33-43); and

transmitting the modified web page source data to the remote client over the computer

network (column 5 lines 1-17).

Lafe fails to explicitly teach wherein the acceleration device is a server-side acceleration

device positioned on the computer network intermediate the remote client and the web server and

intermediate the web server and the wide area network. However, Jungck teaches a data center

(which is an acceleration device) in a reverse proxy configuration (which means server-side,

intermediate the web server and the Internet) that compresses web files for the purpose of

accelerating web transmissions to a work station (remote client) (column 2 lines 21-25, column

3line 65 – column 4 line 12, column 6 lines 12-26 and figure 2).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lafe by making

the acceleration device a server-side acceleration device positioned on the computer network

intermediate the remote client and the web server and intermediate the web server and the wide

area network as per the teachings of Jungck for the purpose of accelerating web transmissions to

a work station.

Lafe fails to explicitly teach after transmitting the modified web page source data to the

remote client, transmitting the original web page source data to the remote client. However,

Brothers teaches after transmitting a modified web page to the remote client, transmitting the

original web page source data to the remote client for the purpose of flexibly viewing web pages

(column 1 lines 48-62, column 2 lines 15-46 and column 5 lines 12-32).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lafe to by

transmitting a modified page to a client, and transmitting the original page to the client in

response to another request from the client for the original page as per the teachings of Brothers

for the purpose of flexibly viewing web pages.

10.   In reference to claim 4, Lafe teaches the method and the networking device of claim 1,

but fails to explicitly teach wherein the original web page source data is sent to the remote client

in response to a subsequent request from the remote client for the original web page source data.

However, Brothers teaches wherein the original web page sent to the remote client is in response

to a subsequent request from the remote client for the original, unfiltered version for the purpose

of flexibly viewing web pages (column 1 lines 48-62, column 2 lines 15-46 and column 5 lines

12-32).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lafe wherein the

original web page source data is sent to the remote client in response to a subsequent request

from the remote client for the original, unfiltered version as per the teachings of Brothers for the

purpose of flexibly viewing web pages and so that the modified version can be viewed before the

original version of the web data.

11.   In reference to claim 5, Lafe teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising,

compressing the modified web page source data before sending it to the remote client (column 5

lines 1-10).

12.   In reference to claim 6, Lafe in view of Jungck teach the method of claim 1, wherein the

web server and the acceleration device are connected by a LAN (Jungck, column 6 lines 20-25).

13.   In reference to claim 7, Lafe teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the acceleration

device and remote client are connected by a WAN (Lafe, column 6 lines 20-38).

14.   In reference to claim 8, Lafe in view of Jungck teach the method of claim 7, wherein the

WAN is the Internet (Jungck, column 1 lines 25-30 and column 4 lines 24-26).

15.   In reference to claims 9 and 23, Lafe teaches the method and networking device of claims

1 and 19 respectively, wherein filtering at least a portion of the non-renderable character data

from the original web page source data comprises filtering character data compatible with the

HTTP data transfer protocol from the original web page source data (column 5 lines 28-53).

16.   In reference to claims 10 and 24, Lafe teaches the method and networking device of

claims 9 and 23 respectively, wherein filtering at least a portion of the non-renderable character

data is HTML data from the original web page source data (column 5 lines 28-53, Lafe

inherently teaches the use of HTML).

17.   In reference to claims 13,27 and 35, Lafe teaches the method, networking device and

system of claims 10,24 and 33 respectively, wherein filtering at least a portion of the non-

renderable character data includes comments from the original web page source data (column 5

lines 28-53, Lafe teaches HTML which inherently has comments in it).

18.   In reference to claims 16 and 30, Lafe teaches method and networking device of claims

10 and 24 respectively, wherein filtering at least a portion of the non-renderable character data

includes commands not interpretable by the remote client from the original web page source data

(column 5 lines 33-37).

19.   In reference to claims 17 and 31, Lafe teaches the method and networking device of

claims 1 and 19 respectively, wherein the filtering and transmitting of the modified web page

source data over the computer network to the remote client are performed in less time than the

original web page source can be directly transmitted from the web server to the remote client

(column 5 lines 5-17).

20.   In reference to claims 18 and 32, Lafe teaches the method and networking device of

claims 1 and 19 respectively, wherein the file size of the modified web page source data is

smaller than the original web page source data (column 5 lines 5-17).

21.   In reference to claims 40 and 42, Lafe teaches the system of claim 33, wherein the

acceleration device is configured to cache the modified web page source data; and to compress

the web resource in real-time before transmission to the remote client (Jungck, column 5 lines

20-45 and column 6 lines 10-30).

22.   Claims 2 and 39 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lafe et

al (US Patent No 6,449,658) in view of Jungck (US Patent No 6,728,785) in further view of

Bodin et al (US Patent No 6,311,223).

23.   In reference to claims 2 and 39, Lafe teaches the method and system of claims 1 and 33,

but fails to explicitly teach wherein filtering further includes filtering tags of the web page source

data by rewriting tags of the web page source data in lowercase. However, Bodin teaches

tokenizing HTML tags to reduce the quantity of data in the file for effective transmission of

HTML files (Summary, column 4 lines 25-47 and column 6 lines 20-32).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lafe by filtering

tags of the web page source data by rewriting tags of the web page source data in lowercase as

per the teachings of Bodin so that the quantity of data in the file is reduced for effective

transmission of HTML files.

24.   Claims 11,12,25,34 and 36 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Lafe et al (US Patent No 6,449,658) in view of Jungck (US Patent No 6,728,785) in

further of Isaac et al (US Patent No 6,424,981).

25.   In reference to claims 11 and 25, Lafe teaches the method of claims 10 and 24

respectively, wherein filtering at least a portion of the non-renderable character data is in the

ASCII format. "Official notice" is taken that ASCII is old and well-known in the art, as taught

by Isaac who teaches that HTML files contain ASCII characters from the original web page

source data (column 1 lines 20-50).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lafe to state that

HTML documents are ASCII coded documents as per the teachings of Isaac because this is a

standard for HTML.

26.   In reference to claims 12,26,34 and 36, Lafe teaches the method of claims 10,24 and 33

respectively, wherein filtering at least a portion of the non-renderable character data includes

white space. "Official notice" is taken that white space is old and well-known in the art, as taught

by Isaac who teaches ASCII coded characters which includes space characters from the original

web page source data (column 1 lines 20-50 and column 6 lines 55-67).

27.   **Claims 14,15,28,29,37 and 39 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable**

over Lafe et al (US Patent No 6,449,658) in view of Jungck (US Patent No 6,728,785) in

further of Edlund et al (US Patent No 6,546,388).

28.   In reference to claims 14,28 and 37, Lafe teaches the method of claims 10,24 and 33, but

fails to explicitly teach wherein filtering at least a portion of the non-renderable character data

includes meta tags from the original web page source data. "Official notice" is taken that meta

tags are old and well-known in the art as being HTML tags that describe some aspect of a web

page (via keywords) that can then be used by a search engine for indexing, and is taught by

Edlund (Abstract and column 2 lines 5-50).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lafe by stating

that HTML includes meta tags as per the teachings of Edlund because HTML documents include

keywords to be used by search engines for indexing.

29.   In reference to claims 15,29 and 38, Lafe teaches the method of claims 10,24 and 33, but

fails to explicitly teach wherein filtering at least a portion of the non-renderable character data

includes keywords configured to be interpreted by a search engine from the original web page

source data. "Official notice" is taken that meta tags are old and well-known in the art as being

HTML tags that describe some aspect of a web page (via keywords) that can then be used by a

search engine for indexing, and is taught by Edlund (Abstract and column 2 lines 5-50).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lafe by stating

that HTML includes meta tags as per the teachings of Edlund because HTML documents include

keywords to be used by search engines for indexing.

30.   **Claims 21-22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lafe et al**

(US Patent No 6,449,658) in view of Jungck (US Patent No 6,728,785) in further view of

Burget (US Patent No 6,557,005).

Lafe teaches the method of claim 21 above, but fails to explicitly teach wherein the

method includes a network communications program logic stored on an ASIC. However, Burget

teaches a program for Internet communication stored on an ASIC, as a known medium of

storage.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lafe to make the

communications program which performs the above method to be stored on an ASIC as per the

teachings of Burget as it is a known medium of storage in the art.

31.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Ramy M. Osman whose telephone number is (571) 272-4008.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RMO
November 10, 2005

ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100